[21st February 1955

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM :—" The industries to which the Employees' Provident Fund Act, 1952, is applicable are specified in Schedule 1 to the Act, a copy of which is available in the Library of the Madras Legislature."

Allegations against the Madras City Police

* 810 Q.—SRI S. PAKKIRISAMI PILLAI : Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether a refugee, Sri Rup Lal Kapur, M.A., of Perambur, Madras, has represented to Government about the unfair treatment given to him by the Madras City Police and the courts;

(b) whether any enquiries have been made on that representation; and

(c) if so, with what result?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" (a) & (b) Yes, Sir.

" (c) Government are satisfied that the allegations made by Sri Rup Lal Kapur against the officers were not justified."

SRI S. PAKKIRISAMI PILLAI :—" I am told that this educated refugee has been subjected to all sorts of hardships and to several terms of imprisonment, simply because one particular constable took revenge against him and took advantage of the fact that he was a refugee. I would like to know from the Hon. Minister whether he would make a re-enquiry into the matter and see that justice is done to this helpless refugee? "

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Sir, some allegations have been made not only against the Police, but against the courts which convicted him and the High Court which heard revision petition. I do not think we can make an enquiry into the judicial proceedings that had taken place."

SRI V. R. NAGARAJAN :—" Sir, what were the allegations made against the courts? "

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Unfair treatment meted out to him by the Madras City Police in launching a case against him in courts."

Loan to agriculturists in Kolathur taluk

* 811 Q.—SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN : Will the Hon. the Minister for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) the number of loan applications of agriculturists under each head received by the Tahsildar of Kolathur taluk in Pudukkottai division of Tiruchirappalli district for 1952–53 and 1953 to the end of October 1954; and

(b) how many of them were (1) allowed and (2) rejected?